Questions & Answers

Note: The questions & answers provided below reflect the releasable answers to RFQ Package questions as of 25 JAN 2008.

Question#	Type of Question	Question	Answer	POC
95	Acquisition	Regarding questions 87, 103, 122 and 220 – Our understanding is that software and hardware will be GFE and are not required to be priced in the proposal. However, the answer to question 220, suggests otherwise. Is it correct to assume BOMs are not expected for software or hardware as part of the proposal?	The Government will provide as GFE all hardware/software utilized in the DISA DECC environments as GFE. However, the PWS requires the Contractor to provide all hardware (e.g., laptops, desktops, and servers required to support contract management activities) and software (except Government mandated security software) that will be utilized within their facilities.	Brian Dudek
96	Acquisition	Will all environments utilized for development be hosted at DISA Mechanicsburg?	Yes.	Brian Dudek
97	Acquisition	The cover of the 080155 PWS V1.5.pdf document says "RFQ-PWS Draft V1.5." Is this the final version of the PWS, or should we be expecting another modification?	Draft should have been removed. This minor oversight will be corrected in version 1.6.	Brian Dudek
98	Acquisition	The new posting has two versions of 080115 App D.pdf added to the web site. One of them has the footers marked "draft" and the other one does not. I assume the one that is not marked draft is the final document from which we should be working, true?	Yes, use the one without the word 'draft'.	Brian Dudek
99	Acquisition	Documents posted on E-Buy on 01/16/2008 and the documents posted to the DLA website on 1/17/2008 were named differently. In addition, there were three documents posted on E-Buy and four documents posted on the DLA website. Please clarify which files constitute the official set of documents documenting Amendment 2.	E-Buy is the official web site for this acquisition. Documents posted on E-Buy and the DLA website are the same with the exception of a draft Appendix D posted on E-Buy. The CO issued instructions to disregard the draft Appendix D posted on E-Buy.	Brian Dudek

Questions & Answers

Note: The questions & answers provided below reflect the releasable answers to RFQ Package questions as of 25 JAN 2008.

100	Acquisition	It would appear that a formatting error at the Management and Integration heading on page 33 in the PWS document entitled (IGC_PWS_V1_5.pdf), incorrectly sequenced the elements that follow throughout the PWS. Therefore, the references to PWS, the PWS section numbers and the Table of Contents are not in alignment. Please advise what the correct sequencing numbers are so we can properly align our proposal.	These discrepancies were corrected in PWS Version 1_6.	Brian Dudek
101	Acquisition	In the PWS document (IGC_PWS_V1_5.pdf) posted on E-buy, PWS 2.4.1.1.1 IGC Requirements Analysis states " The ESP shall conduct an analysis of the GFE-provided RTM to validate against the IDE and GTN/P3I constituent system program baselines to identify disparities." Since analysis of the RTM is required for offerors to adequately understand the level of effort required for the IGC tasks, offerors should have access to the IGC RTM. When will the GFE-provided RTM be available in the reading room to ensure all offerors have appropriate insight into baseline program requirements?	The GFE provided RTM will be provided in the reading room NLT 28 Jan 2008. The GFE high-level RTM is a current aggregate baseline which will continue to evolve until Contract Award. Note this is a requirements baseline and not a constituent systems program baseline.	Brian Dudek
102	Acquisition	In the PWS document (IGC_PWS_V1_5.pdf) posted on E-buy, PWS 2.2.7 Test Management states "The IGC Test and Evaluation methodology is described in the Test and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP) and is consistent with the DOD 5000 series; it will, however, be tailored to meet the unique requirements of IGC" and continues with "The Contractor shall, at a minimum, update the TEMP following contract award and at the Full Rate Production Decision Review." When will the Government make the current TEMP available in the reading room in order to ensure all offerors have appropriate baseline?	These references to the TEMP were removed in PWS Version 1_6.	Brian Dudek

Questions & Answers

Note: The questions & answers provided below reflect the releasable answers to RFQ Package questions as of 25 JAN 2008.

103	Acquisition	In order for offerors to address government-identified IGC risks, when will the government provide a copy of the IGC Risk Management Plan referenced in PWS 2.2.12 in the PWS document (IGC_PWS_V1_5.pdf) posted on E-buy?	The Government's risk management is focused on Program Risk vs System Development. The Contractor's Risk Management Program will focus on system development. The government will not release the IGC Risk Management plan.	Brian Dudek
104	Acquisition	In the RFQ document (IGC-RFQ-GSA-E-BuyV2.pdf) posted on E-buy, RFQ 4.5.2 states that "vendors are encouraged to propose discounts off their existing FSS labor category hourly rates" and "offered discounts will be applied to labor categories and during the entire IGC period of performance." We understand this to mean that in order to provide the deepest possible discounts, thereby ultimately offering the Government the lowest price, this statement does not preclude offering a different discount level by labor category and this does not require the same discount level in all contract years. Will the Government confirm this understanding?	Correct, vendors may propose their own discount methodology in response to this RFQ. In addition the Government anticipates discounts in proposed labor categories other than those identified in the ROMs.	Brian Dudek
105	Acquisition	In the DLA posting of IGC Q&A posted as of 28 December, 2007, question #214 asked "If the contractor is able to provide the Government with significant technical, cost or schedule improvements through the movement of requirements between spirals, would it be acceptable to move functionality specified within the PWS and still be considered a "compliant" proposal offering?" to which the Government's response was "Yes." If it is possible to move work between listed spirals (per Q&A reference #214), how will the government evaluate the fixed price proposals for Task 1 in order to have a common understanding of the work being priced so the cost proposals of each contractor team can be fairly evaluated?	We are coordinating response and answer will be provided shortly.	Brian Dudek

Questions & Answers

Note: The questions & answers provided below reflect the releasable answers to RFQ Package questions as of 25 JAN 2008.

106	Acquisition	Is it the intention of the government to allocate contractor workspace at the DECC?	No. All activities are performed at the contractor's facility. However, the contractor may perform visits to these facilities to perform required tasks.	Brian Dudek
107	Acquisition	The PWS document (IGC_PWS_V1_5.pdf) posted on E-buy, Para 2.3.1 directs the contractor to utilize tools/services listed in Table 2.5-1. A review of Table 2.5-1, Table 2.5-2, and the text in between suggests the Table 2.5-2 should have been cited vice 2.5-1. Please clarify.	You are correct. This error was corrected in PWS Version 1_6.	Brian Dudek
108	Acquisition	Does the government have a deadline for submission of questions on this procurement?	Yes. 13 FEB 2008.	Brian Dudek
109	Acquisition	Section 4.6.2 of the IGC RFQ uses bold face italics to say: "The proposed format for the oral presentation is as follows (and is subject to change): Introductions and overview 15 minutes; Technical Approach 1 hour; Management Approach 25 minutes; Corporate Experience/Past Performance 25 minutes; Business & Price Proposal 25 minutes; and Q&A/Wrap up 30 minutes. Is this time breakdown a requirement or a guideline that allows some flexibility?	It is a guideline.	Brian Dudek
110	Acquisition	Section 4.6.3 says: "the team lead individual who signs the proposal and commits the firm must also be present at the oral presentation." Since our contracting officers sign such obligations, it isn't clear if a company executive can attend and speak. May a company executive attend and speak at orals?	Yes.	Brian Dudek
111	Acquisition	Can the ESP assume that the latest versions of each COTS product will be available to use if there are significant features in releases later than those listed in Table 2.5-2 in the PWS document (IGC_PWS_V1_5.pdf) posted on E-buy?	We have updated the PWS to include specific product versions.	Brian Dudek

Questions & Answers

Note: The questions & answers provided below reflect the releasable answers to RFQ Package questions as of 25 JAN 2008.

112	Acquisition	In the RFQ document (IGC-RFQ-GSA-E-BuyV2.pdf) posted on E-buy, Section 3.3.1 added a new Task Area delineation to the Task Area Pricing Summary for "Task Area I Management and Integration"; however, the paragraph that would reference this task area appears to have been omitted. Please clarify whether Section 3.3.1 should have additional information addressing this new task area.	We added a reference to Para 3.3.1 in Amendment 0004	Brian Dudek
113	Acquisition	In the RFQ document (IGC-RFQ-GSA-E-BuyV2.pdf) posted on E-buy, Section 1.12 states: "*..and are those persons whose resumes are to be submitted as part of the technical and Price Proposal, as outlined in Section 4.*" While these Key Personnel are referenced in RFQ Section 4.3.2.4 Key Personnel (Management – Volume III), no mention is made anywhere in RFQ Section 4.5 Business/Price Proposal (Volume V). Please clarify which Volume requires resumes.	Volume III, Management	Brian Dudek
114	Acquisition	Given the significant complexity of the procurement, the significant amendments and the questions still to be answered, will the Government extend the proposal due date by two weeks in order for offerors to provide the most complete, compliant and competitive proposals.	We will extend the due date one week.	Brian Dudek
115	Acquisition	Is there any restriction to a Team Member of a Prime having a subcontractor support them on a task, particularly supporting Task Areas 1-3?	A team member may have a subcontractor working for them as long as all terms and conditions of the GSA schedule are met. ESP may not team with FADS.	Brian Dudek

Note: The questions & answers provided below reflect the releasable answers to RFQ Package questions as of 25 JAN 2008.

| 116 | Acquisition | PWS section 2.6.1.10 (page 84) is titled Knowledge Transfer and begins "The ESP shall, in coordination with the Government, provide for knowledge transfer (as described in paragraph 2.3.11) to facilitate execution of the sustainment activities within this Task Area." Paragraph 2.3.11 includes two sections: 2.3.11.1 Knowledge Transfer and 2.3.11.2 Training. Does the reference in 2.6.1.10 refer to both sections in 2.3.11? | Applies to 2.3.11.1 | Brian Dudek |
| 117 | Acquisition | Two RFP statements appear to be in conflict with respect to GTN P3I and IDE development support for IGC sustainment. PWS section 2.5 (page 60) states: "This section describes the initial IGC Planning and Transition services required to transition the previous GTN/P3I and IDE development to the ESP, and continue the development under a single program (IGC)." This statement supports our understanding that the incumbent GTN P3I and IDE development and sustainment tasks end on September 30, 2008. However, RFQ section 4.3.1.3.3 on IGC sustainment states: "The vendor's proposal shall reflect that these are hosted by DISA with sustainment support provided by GTN P3I developer, IDE developer, DISA Operational Support Team (OST), and legacy GTN." The second statement implies that the incumbent developer of GTN P3I and IDE will still be under contract and providing support. Please clarify. | These discrepancies were corrected in PWS Version 1_6. | Brian Dudek |

Questions & Answers

Note: The questions & answers provided below reflect the releasable answers to RFQ Package questions as of 25 JAN 2008.

118	Acquisition	Two RFP statements appear to be in conflict with respect to GTN legacy support. PWS section 2.6 (page 81) states: "Sustainment of legacy GTN environment and software is not within the scope of this contract." However, RFQ section 4.3.1.3.3 states: "The vendor's proposal shall reflect that these are hosted by DISA with sustainment support provided by GTN P3I developer, IDE developer, DISA Operational Support Team (OST), and legacy GTN." What is the expected relationship between IGC sustainment and legacy GTN?	These discrepancies were corrected in PWS Version 1_6.	Brian Dudek
119	Acquisition	In question # 200 in the Questions and Answers released December 10, 2007, it was asked: "Can the government provide a list of all companies that have an OCI issue…?" The government response indicated that the answer would be in the RFQ. The only firm mentioned in the RFQ is The Mitre Corporation, in RFQ section 4.1.2. Will the government please confirm that no other companies have an OCI issue?	We are coordinating response and and answer will be provided shortly.	Brian Dudek
120	Acquisition	Please clarify the Order of Precedence within the solicitation? FAR 52.212-4 Contract Terms and Conditions – Commercial Items (Sep 2005)(Tailored)(Deviation – May 2003) incorporated into the baseline IT Schedule Contract places the Schedule of Supplies/Services at the top of the order of precedence. However, the RFQ states that the RFQ specific terms and conditions take precedence over any conflicting provisions that are contained in the GSA schedule contract. This appears to be in conflict with the IT Schedule.	The sentence in section 1.2 of the RFQ stating that the RFQ will take precedence over the GSA schedule when a conflict arises will be deleted in a future amendment	Brian Dudek

Note: The questions & answers provided below reflect the releasable answers to RFQ Package questions as of 25 JAN 2008.

121	Acquisition	Reference: Use of GSA Schedules. In Section 1.5, the government stated that "offered discounts would be applied to all labor categories used during the entire IGC period of performance". Is it the government's intent for offerors to propose a single / uniform BPA discount percentage for all labor categories?	The Government's intent is not to have a single uniform BPA discount but rather to have each vendor propose their own discount methodology.	Brian Dudek
122	Acquisition	Reference: Ordering Period / Task Order IV Request For Quote Spreadsheet. The government stated that the BPA ordering period will be five years, however the spreadsheet has provisions for just four Fiscal Years. Would the government please clarify?	Per the IGC RFQ Checklist on Page 41: "For 10 notional tasks per year; 1 OCT 08 - 30 JUN 13, by Year; Mapped to labor categories per Addendum D." The FY 13 portion is cut off by the conversion to Adobe format. Same applies to Task area 3.	Brian Dudek
123	Acquisition	Reference: Key Personnel (Task Area IV). The government has identified four key labor categories, however in the Government Rough Order of Magnitude (D-3.3.), there are five key personnel labor categories. Is the Information Security Specialist considered a key position? In addition, there were no hours provided for the Engineering Lead (Key Personnel). Is this correct?	Per the IGC RFQ Checklist on Page 41: there are 4 Key personnel for FADS. The Information Security specialist is not one of them. Just the 4 indicated on the checklist. There should be 40 hours against the Engineering Lead (Key Personnel); they are incorrectly mapped to Software Engineer. We will change that.	Brian Dudek
124	Acquisition	Reference: Government Rough Order of Magnitude. The government has not provided information relative to the availability of government facilitates for the performance of work in Task Area IV. Would awardees be able to use their Schedule 70 government site labor rates under the BPA, if government facilities were available an a task basis?	We do not expect Gov't facilities to be available. Vendors will perform work from their facilities (less meetings, etc.). If something changes during the life of the BPA, rates will be negotiated appropriately.	Brian Dudek